



**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

FILED

02/15/18
04:59 PM

Order Instituting Investigation on the
Commission's Own Motion into the Rates,
Operations, Practices, Services and Facilities
of Southern California Edison Company and
San Diego Gas and Electric Company
Associated with the San Onofre Nuclear
Generating Station Units 2 and 3.

Investigation 12-10-013
(Filed October 25, 2012)

And Related Matters.

Application 13-01-016
Application 13-03-005
Application 13-03-013
Application 13-03-014

**RESPONSE OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E) TO JOINT
RULING OF ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DATED FEBRUARY 6, 2018**

WALKER A. MATTHEWS, III
RUSSELL A. ARCHER
Southern California Edison Company
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Post Office Box 800
Rosemead, CA 91770
Telephone: (626) 302-6879
Facsimile: (626) 302-3990
E-mail: *Walker.Matthews@sce.com*

HENRY WEISSMANN
Munger, Tolles & Olson LLP
350 South Grand Avenue, 50th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: (213) 683-9150
Facsimile: (213) 683-5150
E-mail: *Henry.Weissmann@mto.com*

Attorneys for
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

Dated: February 15, 2018

Pursuant to Ruling Paragraph 5 of the Joint Ruling of Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge dated February 6, 2018,¹ Southern California Edison (“SCE”) respectfully submits the attached Declaration of Russell C. Swartz.

Date: February 15, 2018

Respectfully Submitted,

WALKER A. MATTHEWS
RUSSELL A. ARCHER
HENRY WEISSMANN

/s/ Henry Weissmann
By: Henry Weissmann

Attorneys for
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

¹ Joint Ruling of Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge Granting in Part and Denying in Part the Joint Motion of the Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility, the California Large Energy Consumers Association, California State University, Citizens Oversight, the Coalition of California Utility Employees, the Direct Access Customer Coalition, Ruth Henricks, the Office of Ratepayer Advocates, San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U 902-E), Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E), the Utility Reform Network, and Women’s Energy Matters to Stay Proceedings in Investigation 12-10-013 et al. (Feb. 6, 2018).

Appendix A

Declaration of Russell C. Swartz

DECLARATION OF RUSSELL C. SWARTZ

I, Russell C. Swartz, declare as follows:

1. I am Senior Vice President and General Counsel for Southern California Edison Company. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this declaration.

2. I submit this declaration in response to the February 6, 2018, Joint Ruling of Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge Granting in Part and Denying in Part the Joint Motion to Stay Proceedings in Investigation 12-10-013 et al. ("Joint Ruling"), as clarified by the Email Ruling: I.12-10-013 Clarification of Feb[ru]ary 6, 2018 Ruling in Response to Email Sent to ALJ on February 9, 2018 ("February 14 Ruling").

3. The Joint Ruling identifies three agreements: (a) the January 30, 2018, proposed Settlement Agreement ("Settlement Agreement"), (b) the January 10, 2018, Utility Shareholder Agreement between Southern California Edison Company ("SCE") and San Diego Gas & Electric Company ("SDG&E") (and their respective parent companies), and (c) the January 30, 2018, Federal Court Agreement, between Plaintiffs in the Federal Court action and SCE.


4. The February 14 Ruling clarifies that the Joint Parties are to identify all agreements, including agreements relating to the mediation process or to litigation of the OII, insofar as those agreements "relate to the proposed settlement agreement, and or have provisions/terms that are contingent upon or make reference to the Commission adopting the proposed settlement." The February 14 Ruling states that agreements that are subject to Rule 12.6 or that have been superseded by the proposed Settlement Agreement or are no longer operative are excluded from this directive, as are the 2014 settlement agreement and its amendment.

5. As part of the mediation process, the Joint Parties entered into the following agreements: (1) an agreement among themselves and with Phillips ADR to retain Phillips ADR to provide mediation services, including financial terms of such retention, (2) an agreement with Phillips ADR regarding the protocols for the mediation process, (3) agreements among themselves and with Phillips ADR regarding confidentiality of the mediation, and (4)

nondisclosure agreements among the Joint Parties pursuant to which certain confidential information was provided in the mediation process. These agreements predated, and therefore necessarily did not refer to the Settlement Agreement, but Southern California Edison Company is identifying them out of an abundance of caution. In addition, the Joint Parties had various informal agreements relating to the scheduling of meetings and calls, related logistics, allocation of responsibility for drafting pleadings and agreements, and similar matters that are not contingent upon and do not make reference to the Commission adopting the Settlement Agreement.

6. Other than the agreements identified in paragraphs 3 and 5 above or excluded by the directive as explained in paragraph 4, Southern California Edison Company is not aware of any agreement between or among any of the Joint Parties, or between any of the Joint Parties and any third party, that relates to the proposed Settlement Agreement or has provisions/terms that are contingent upon or make reference to the Commission adopting the proposed Settlement Agreement.

I declare pursuant to Rule 1.1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. Executed at Rosemead, California on February 15, 2018.


Russell C. Swartz